

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are now pending in the application. Minor amendments have been made to the specification and claims to simply overcome the objections to the specification and rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed March 15, 2002 has not been considered because it fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Applicants enclose herewith a copy of each of the references cited in the International Search Report, along with a copy of the International Search Report indicating the portion of each patent which caused it to be listed.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to for certain informalities. Applicant(s) have attached revised drawings for the Examiner's approval. In the "Replacement Sheets" Applicants have amended Figs. 1-4 to include the legend "Prior Art". Applicants have amended Figs. 7, 9, 10 and 12 to include the reference sign 161a mentioned in the description on page 12, line 1.

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheets" of drawings include changes to Figures 1-4, 7, 9-10, and 12. The attached "Replacement Sheets," which include Figures 1-14, replace the original sheets including Figures 1-14.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions and in order to more fully comply with U.S. Patent and Trademark Office standards of practice. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Minor amendments have been made to the claims to more clearly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by SU1653730 ('730). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner asserts that the '730 reference discloses a main body 1, wheels 10 rotatably mounted at both sides of the main body 1, an exhaust flow passage 8 formed between the main body 1 and the wheels 10 for discharging the air cleaned within the main body 1, and an air exhaust filter 7 provided at the exhaust flow passage 8 for filtering fine dust contained in the air.

However, the air exhaust filter 7 disclosed in '730 is mounted at the main body 1 together as an integral part of the wheel 10.

In contrast, the air exhaust filter of the present invention in amended claim 1 is not the type to be fixed at the wheel, but separately formed.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by JP8-252196 ('196). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner cites the '196 reference as disclosing a main body 2, wheels 13 and 53 rotatably mounted at both sides of the main body 2, an exhaust flow passage formed between the main body 2 and the wheels 53 for discharging the air cleaned within the main body 2, and an air exhaust filter 11 provided at the exhaust flow passage for filtering fine dust contained in the cleaned air once again.

However, the air exhaust filter 11 disclosed in '196 is mounted at the main body 2 together with the wheel 53, with the air exhaust filter 11 being fixed at an inner surface of the main body 2 or an inner surface of the wheel 53 such that the air exhaust filter 11 is provided at the exhaust flow passage. For example, a piece of filter material is affixed to the inner surface of the element, but is not firmly held between two structural members that define the wheel.

In view of the reasons set forth above, the cited references fail to teach or suggest all features and advantages of the present invention. Therefore, we believe that claim 1 has a novelty over the cited references. Dependent claim 2 is allowable for its dependency on claim 1 as well as for its additional features.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 3-23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and


to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have amended claims 3-23 to overcome this rejection. Therefore, claims 3-23 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (703) 668-8000.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 01/31/04

By: 
Terry L. Clark, Reg. No. 32,644
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, VA 20195
(703) 668-8000

TLC/dab